

NIGMS PROGRAM PROJECT AND RESEARCH CENTER GRANT APPLICATIONS

INFORMATION FOR CONSULTANTS

I. CONSULTANT DUTIES: Program Project Grant (PPG) and Research Center Grant (RCG) applications to the National Institute of General Medical Sciences (NIGMS) are reviewed by Scientific Review Groups (SRGs), either standing study sections or special emphasis panels, in accordance with procedures used by the Center for Scientific Review. When deemed necessary, the review may take place in conjunction with a site visit. Consultants are assigned to review specific aspects of the application based on their expertise, but they should be familiar with the entire application in order to participate effectively in all of the review proceedings.

II. CONFIDENTIALITY: Applications and related materials furnished for review purposes, discussions held during the site visit and SRG meeting, and outcomes of the review process are confidential and must be handled appropriately. All communication between applicants and consultants regarding any aspect of the review must be through the scientific review administrator (SRA) or appropriate NIH staff members.

III. CONFLICT OF INTEREST: Even the appearance of possible conflict of interest can be cause for re-review at considerable expense. Consultants should advise the SRA of any present and past associations (e.g., collaboration, mentor-student, or employment) between them or their family members and the personnel or institutions listed in the application, and they must sign the conflict of interest forms provided.

IV. REVIEWS INVOLVING A SITE VISIT:

A. Pre-Site Visit: When a site visit is made, the entire team meets prior to the visit for orientation, to finalize review assignments, to identify questions that need to be asked and information that needs to be gathered on site, and to address procedural details that are essential to the conduct of the site visit.

B. Site Visit: The purpose of a site visit is to gather information needed for the review. This must be done in a way that ensures a fair appraisal and does not convey the reviewers' opinions to the applicants. Direct and forthright questions are encouraged but should be worded so that they cannot be construed as recommendations or judgments. Avoid evaluative comments and inferences. The chairperson moderates the scientific discussions at the site visit and SRG meeting. The team should arrive on site and leave together, and the SRA should be present during all discussions with the applicants.

C. Post-Site Visit: Immediately following a site visit, the team reconvenes (usually at the hotel) to review the information gained, to consider the appropriate actions, and to determine reviewers' levels of enthusiasm for each component and for the application as a whole. The goals are to ensure that all pertinent review issues have been resolved and that each reviewer's report reflects the opinions of the entire team. These deliberations are not binding until the group convenes and takes official actions as an SRG.

V. SRG MEETING: The SRG meeting begins with an orientation by the SRA, and the chairperson conducts the review in accordance with the guidelines delineated below. Written reports for each component and the overall application are read, discussed, and acted upon. Following discussion of each research component, reviewers individually assign priority ratings, recommend/vote on budget levels, and determine whether that component should be included in the PPG or RCG. For each non-research core component, the SRG recommends appropriate budget levels. The overall application is then considered, each reviewer assigns an overall priority rating, and the group recommends overall budget levels. Priority ratings are assigned in increments of 0.1 and range from 1.0 (the most meritorious) to 5.0 (the least meritorious). A motion to "not recommend for further consideration" (NRFC) may be considered if a research component or overall application lacks significant and substantial merit or there are serious concerns regarding the use of human subjects or animals. If the SRG finds that additional information is needed to complete a review, it may consider a deferral. If a motion to NRFC or defer is passed, that component (or the overall application) is not rated, and the budget is not considered. Administrative notes (e.g., to address issues such as budgetary overlap) may be added for any component and for the overall application.

VI. REPORTS: Consultants prepare written reports for their assigned portions of the review prior to the conclusion of the review meeting. When there is a site visit, consultants should arrive with preliminary written reports and modify them as needed following the site visit. Consultants must carefully follow the detailed instructions provided below, in the section entitled "Guidelines for Review and Written Reports."

GUIDELINES FOR REVIEW AND WRITTEN REPORTS

Each Program Project or Research Center grant application submitted to NIGMS includes an initial section that describes the overall application and justifies the use of this mechanism, followed by separate, largely self-sufficient sections that present the individual research and core components. In accord with established NIH practice, the SRG first reviews the research components separately as independent, as well as interdependent, research efforts; the SRG then reviews the scientific merit and coherence of the overall grant application as a synergistic and interactive enterprise. These reviews are based on the criteria enumerated below, and the application must meet the same standards required in the review of regular (individual R01) research grants. The guidelines for the review of the individual research components reflect the new NIH review criteria and basis for assigning a priority score (NIH GUIDE, Volume 26, Number 22, June 27, 1997). **In preparing reports, remember that the summary statement (which is sent to the applicant) will normally be compiled using unedited reviewer comments; do not include personal identifiers.**

I. **RESEARCH COMPONENTS** (Consultants): Each research component is individually reviewed, scored, and recommended for inclusion or exclusion.

A. **DESCRIPTION**: The description will be taken from the application (abstract).

B. **CRITIQUE** (include as little descriptive information in this section as possible): The goals of NIH-supported research are to advance our understanding of biological systems, improve the control of disease, and enhance health. In your written reviews, you should comment on the following aspects of each project in order to judge the likelihood that the proposed research will have a substantial impact on the pursuit of these goals. Address each criterion listed below in a separate section. **For competing continuation (renewal) applications**, include an evaluation of progress over the past project period; **for amended applications**, address progress, changes, and responses to the critiques in the summary statement from the previous review, indicating whether the application has been strengthened or weakened since the previous submission. Comments on progress and response to the previous review may be provided in a separate paragraph or under the appropriate criteria.

Significance: Does this study address an important problem? If the aims of the application are achieved, how will scientific knowledge be advanced? What will be the effect of these studies on the concepts or methods that drive this field?

Approach: Are the conceptual framework, design, methods, and analyses adequately developed, well integrated, and appropriate to the aims of the project? Does the applicant acknowledge potential problem areas and consider alternative tactics?

Innovation: Does the project employ novel concepts, approaches or methods? Are the aims original and innovative? Does the project challenge existing paradigms or develop new methodologies or technologies?

Investigator: Is the investigator appropriately trained and well suited to carry out this work? Is the work proposed appropriate to the experience level of the principal investigator and other researchers (if any)? **DO NOT INCLUDE** descriptive biographical information unless important to the evaluation of merit.

Environment: Does the scientific environment in which the work will be done contribute to the probability of success? Do the proposed experiments take advantage of unique features of the scientific environment or employ useful collaborative arrangements? Is there evidence of institutional support? **DO NOT INCLUDE** description of available facilities or equipment unless important to the evaluation of merit.

Interdependence: To what extent are there interactions between this and other components? Does this component contribute significantly to the overall application?

Summary: Briefly summarize the most important points of the critique, addressing the strengths and weaknesses that most influence your evaluation of the project.

Scoring: Recommend a priority rating that reflects the **overall impact** of the project on its field, weighting the above criteria (and other relevant considerations as detailed below) as you feel appropriate for each project. A project does not need to be strong in all categories to be judged likely to have a major scientific impact and thus deserve a high merit rating. For example, an investigator may propose to carry out important work that by its nature is not innovative but is essential to move a field forward. As appropriate, an SRG may vote to NRFC a project or defer for additional information. If a vote on a motion to NRFC any component is not unanimous, whether the motion fails or passes, a minority report will be required whenever there are two or more dissenting reviewers.

C: **BUDGET:** Recommend scientifically appropriate and justified budget levels for each year; provide a rationale for each recommended budget change. Recommend the inclusion or exclusion of the research component in the overall PPG or RCG.

D: **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:** Refer also to the PHS 398 or the enclosed "Review Procedures for Initial Review Group Meetings." Address each item below in a separate section of your report as appropriate.

Subject Population Issues: For studies involving human subjects, determine gender, "G," and minority, "M," representations and inclusion of children, "C," in each subject population. Categorize representation in each area by number (see below) and assign a letter indicating whether the expected representation is scientifically acceptable, "A," and consistent with the aims of the project or unacceptable, "U," (e.g., G3U, M1A, C2A, etc.). A "U" rating should be considered a weakness or deficiency in the experimental design, which is reflected in the priority score and addressed in the "Approach" section of the critique. (If a Phase III clinical trial is proposed, the evaluation criteria are more stringent.)

<u>CATEGORY</u>	<u>Gender (G)</u>	<u>Minority (M)</u>	<u>Children (C)</u>
1	females and males	minority and non-minority	children and adults
2	females only	only minority	only children
3	males only	only non-minority	no children
4	unknown	minority representation unknown	representation of children unknown

Human Subjects: Are exemptions claimed appropriate? If no exemptions are claimed, are the required six points on involvement and protection of human subjects addressed? Are risks reasonable relative to the project's stated aims and anticipated benefits to subjects? Note any comments or concerns.

Animal Welfare: Are the required five points on care and use of vertebrate animal addressed? Are the procedures described appropriate and necessary for the conduct of scientifically sound research? Note any comments or concerns.

Biohazards: Note any potentially hazardous materials or procedures and indicate whether the proposed protective measures will be adequate.

Overlap (an administrative issue, for consideration by NIH staff but not included in the merit rating): Identify any apparent scientific or budgetary overlap with active or pending support.

II. **CORE COMPONENTS** (Consultants): Non-research core components are evaluated but not scored; appropriate budget levels must be determined.

A. **DESCRIPTION:** Will be taken from application.

B. **CRITIQUE:** Assess the quality of services and facilities provided, their cost-effectiveness, their utility to the program, and the extent to which they benefit two or more of the research components.

C. **BUDGET:** Recommend budget levels for each year that are scientifically appropriate and justified by their contributions to the overall application; provide a rationale for each recommended budget change.

D. **OTHER:** Address Human Subject, Animal Welfare, Biohazard, and Overlap issues as appropriate.

III. **OVERALL APPLICATION:** Following review of the individual research and core components, the PPG or RCG application is reviewed as a whole. An overall numerical rating is assigned privately by each consultant, unless a majority of the SRG votes to NRFC or to defer the application for additional information. (A minority report is required if there are two or more dissenting reviewers on a vote to NRFC.) The overall priority score indicates the scientific merit and the synergy of the entire application; it should reflect the interdependence of the components and their potential to contribute to the overall success of the enterprise; it is not an average of the scores assigned to individual components. For example, one or more of the research components may have very high scientific merit but lack relevance or contribute little to the PPG or RCG as a whole; conversely, research components with relatively lower scientific merit may provide necessary strengths to the other components and to the overall application.

A. **RESUME** (SRA or Chairperson, as assigned): Summarize, in paragraph form, the bases for the panel's recommendations, indicating the key strengths and weaknesses of the individual research components and of the PPG or RCG application as a whole.

B. **OVERALL DESCRIPTION:** Applicant's description (abstract) will be used.

C. **OVERALL CRITIQUE (Consultants):** Provide appropriate background information on the submission of this application--especially for renewal, supplemental, or amended applications. Briefly address the unifying research focus and long-range goals of the program project, the chief approaches and disciplines involved in the application, and the rationale for research in this area.

Based on the criteria enumerated below for the review of the overall application, provide a detailed account of the strengths and weaknesses of the PPG or RCG application as a whole. Evaluate critically the extent of the interactions among the components and among the investigators that have led to the panel's overall assessments and the overall priority rating. Explain briefly how the strengths and weaknesses of the individual components impact on the assessment of the overall application. Each of the criteria should be addressed, but there need not be separate headings:

The overall scientific strengths and weaknesses of the application, including the significance of the overall scientific question(s) being addressed, and the scientific gain (or loss) accrued by this combination of individual research components into a PPG or RCG.

The scientific and administrative coherence among the research components, including any administrative mechanisms proposed to promote coordinated scientific planning and interaction among the participants.

The interactions and collaborations among the participating investigators.

The director's scientific and administrative experience and ability with respect to the leadership and administration of the proposed PPG or RCG.

The mechanisms proposed to evaluate the progress of the individual components and of the entire PPG or RCG and to allocate and manage resources, including the use of internal and external advisory groups.

The scientific and intellectual environment and adequacy of the physical resources (noting any special resources, animal models, and clinical facilities that would affect the conduct of this application).

D. **OVERALL BUDGET:** Recommend an overall summary budget, including duration.

E. **ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE(S):** If the SRG considers any administrative issues (such as overlap with other funding sources, consortium or consultant arrangements, delegation of management responsibility, or institutional support) sufficiently important to include in the summary statement as advice to NIGMS staff, then one or more consultants will be designated to detail these issues in a short paragraph.